



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,758	12/12/2003	Taro Ishikawa	010755.52992US	8747
23911	7590	12/12/2007		
CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			EXAMINER KAO, JUTAI	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/733,758	Applicant(s) ISHIKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Ju-Tai Kao	Art Unit 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Amendments made to the drawings and specifications are accepted and the corresponding objections have been removed.

Amendments made to the claims are entered. The amendments change the scopes of the original claims. New grounds of rejections are applied to the claims to cover the new claim limitations.

Response to Arguments

In the applicant's remark filed on 10/15/2007, the argument was made that the cited prior art does not include calculating state information from the header information and payload information. However, a new reference teaching checking for non-conformance by correlating header synchronization sequences is applied to form a new 35 USC 103 rejection. This non-conformance testing technique involves correlating the header sync sequence of the received packets with the acceptable header sync sequence and comparing the correlation result with a threshold value to determine whether the received packet is conforming or nonconforming. That is, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention may modify the non-conformance test of the previously cited prior art to also include the header synchronization sequence correlation test of the newly cited prior art, which involves retrieving the header synchronization sequence from the header information and payload information of the received packet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hernandez-Valencia (US 6,266,327) in view of Gothe (US 6,049,577).

Hernandez-Valencia discloses a non-conformance indicator for the guaranteed frame rate service including the following features.

Regarding claim 1, an automatic detecting method for a protocol nonconformity (see “a conformance algorithm...evaluates, in real time...” recited in column 1, line 56-67) in a transmitting and receiving control process (see “evaluates...a received data stream from a user against the user’s predefined traffic set” recited in column 1, line 67 to column 2, line 2; that is, the evaluation step being the control process) occurring in the communications (see “received data stream” recited in column 2, line 1; receiving a stream being a communication) between transmitting (see “from other users” recited in column 4, line 53) and receiving terminals (see “received by ATM switch 105” recited in column 4, line 53) that make at least one transmitting and receiving control process (see “sets the PTI field” disclosed in the abstract) in accordance with a predetermined communication protocol (see “Guaranteed Frame Rate service (GFR)” recited in column 1, line 22), said method comprising: a calculation step of calculating the state information regarding a transmitting and receiving state of a packet (see “the conformance algorithm measures the above described...values” recited in column 2, line 8-9, wherein these values represents states of the received packet stream) to correspond to a result of transmitting and receiving control (the result of receiving the packets) in accordance with said communication protocol (see “As part of providing the GFR service, a conformance algorithm is used...” recited in column 1, line 56-58; GFR being the communication protocol and the conformance algorithm being the transmitting and receiving control) by acquiring the packet transmitted or received (see “received data stream” recited in column 2, line 1) in the communications between said transmitting and receiving terminals (explained above), in an actual communication

state (see “conformance algorithm evaluates, in real time, a received data stream from a user...” recited in column 1, line 67 to column 2 line 2; that is, the calculation step is performed during an actual receiving step of a communication); and a comparison step (see “a comparison is made” recited in column 6, line 23) of comparing the state information calculated at said calculation step (explained above, also see “Cnt variable” recited in column 6, line 23) and the nonconformity information (see “traffic set...peak cell rate...maximum frame size (MFS)...” recited in column 1, line 60-67) featuring nonconformity (see “greater than the MFS” recited in column 6, line 24) being accumulated in advance (see “a maximum number of cells over a period of time, T” recited in column 1, line 61-63; which is a measurement of number of cells accumulated over a period of time in advance of determining the number being nonconforming) in said at least one transmitting and receiving control process (explained above); wherein the transmitting and receiving control process (explained above) where said nonconformity occurs is detected (see “the frame is marked as a non-conforming frame” recited in column 6, line 26) based on a comparison result at said comparison step (see “If the value of the Cnt variable is greater than the MFS...” recited in column 6, line 24-25).

Regarding claim 2, an estimation step of specifying the transmitting and receiving control process to be made based on the packet transmitted or received at said transmitting and receiving terminal (see “a comparison is made...the value of the Cnt variable is greater than the MFS...” recited in column 6, line 23-24; the comparison being the control process) in accordance with said communication protocol (see “As

part of providing the GFR service, a conformance algorithm is used...” recited in column 1, line 56-67; the GFR being the communication protocol), and estimating the normal information corresponding to a processing result that said specified transmitting and receiving control process is normally performed (see “maximum frame size (MFS)” recited in column 1, line 65-66; that is, frames transmitted in the GFR service would have a maximum frame size of the MFS), wherein said nonconformity information defines a relation between the state information calculated at said calculation step when there is said nonconformity and said normal information (see “If the value of the Cnt variable is greater than the MFS...” recited in column 6, line 24-29; nonconformity being the relation where Cnt is greater than the normal MFS).

Regarding claim 3, wherein said nonconformity information defines a relation (explained in the rejection to claim 1 and 2, see “If the value of the Cnt variable is greater than the MFS...” recited in column 6, line 24-29; nonconformity relation being that the measured Cnt being greater than the normal MFS) between said state information (explained in the rejection to claim 1, “measures...values” recited in column 2, line 8-9; the measured values being the state information) and a fixed value (see “permitted MFS value of the traffic set is equal to 6” recited in column 2, line 10-11) confirmed in advance (see “predefined traffic set” recited in column 2, line 2) for the nonconformity in said transmitting and receiving control process (the conformance algorithm explained in the rejection made to claim 1 and 2).

Regarding claim 4, wherein said calculation step further comprises updating said state information every time acquiring the packet (see “a new cell from the received

data stream arrives...” recited in column 6 line 11-29 and Fig. 3-8; where each of the conformance check algorithm flowcharts in Fig. 3-8 shows a series of checks performed on each new cell received and updating values, such as Cnt in step 325, 425, etc.), and said comparison step further comprises comparing the latest state information updated at said calculation step and said nonconformity information (see Fig. 3, step 330, checking the calculated Cnt against the MFS).

Regarding claim 6, an automatic detecting apparatus (see ATM switch 105 in Fig. 2) for a protocol nonconformity (see “a conformance algorithm...evaluates, in real time...” recited in column 1, line 56-67) in a transmitting and receiving control process (see “evaluates...a received data stream from a user against the user’s predefined traffic set” recited in column 1, line 67 to column 2, line 2; that is, the evaluation step being the control process) occurring in the communications (see “received data stream” recited in column 2, line 1; receiving a stream being a communication) between transmitting (see “from other users” recited in column 4, line 53) and receiving terminals (see “received by ATM switch 105” recited in column 4, line 53) that make at least one transmitting and receiving control process (see “sets the PTI field” disclosed in the abstract) in accordance with a predetermined communication protocol (see “Guaranteed Frame Rate service (GFR)” recited in column 1, line 22), said apparatus comprising: packet acquiring means (see “ATM switch” recited in column 4, line 45) for acquiring a packet to be transmitted or received in the communications between said transmitting and receiving terminals (see “ATM switch 105, receives a user data stream...is a gateway element for transmission...” recited in column 4, line 45-55); calculation means

(see "ATM switch 105 evaluates user data stream 101 for conformance..." recited in column 5, line 1-3) for calculating the state information regarding a transmitting and receiving state of said packet (see "the conformance algorithm measures the above described...values" recited in column 2, line 8-9, wherein these values represents states of the received packet stream) to correspond to a result of transmitting and receiving control (the result of receiving the packets) in accordance with said communication protocol (see "As part of providing the GFR service, a conformance algorithm is used..." recited in column 1, line 56-58; GFR being the communication protocol and the conformance algorithm being the transmitting and receiving control) based on said packet acquired by said packet acquiring means (see "evaluates user data stream...to the user's traffic set..." recited in column 5, line 1-4) in an actual communication state (see "conformance algorithm evaluates, in real time, a received data stream from a user..." recited in column 1, line 67 to column 2 line 2; that is, the calculation step is performed during an actual receiving step of a communication); comparison means (see "ATM...evaluates user data stream...to the user's traffic set..." recited in column 5, line 1-4) for comparing the comparing the state information calculated by said calculation means (explained above, also see "Cnt variable" recited in column 6, line 23) and the nonconformity information (see "traffic set...peak cell rate...maximum frame size (MFS)..." recited in column 1, line 60-67) featuring nonconformity (see "greater than the MFS" recited in column 6, line 24) in said at least one transmitting and receiving control process (explained above), said nonconformity information being accumulated in advance (see "predefined traffic set" recited in column 2, line 2); wherein the

transmitting and receiving control process (explained above) where said nonconformity occurs is detected (see “the frame is marked as a non-conforming frame” recited in column 6, line 26) based on a comparison result from said comparison means (see “If the value of the Cnt variable is greater than the MFS...” recited in column 6, line 24-25).

Regarding claim 7, estimation means for specifying a transmitting and receiving control process to be made for the packet acquired at said transmitting and receiving terminal (see “a comparison is made...the value of the Cnt variable is greater than the MFS...” recited in column 6, line 23-24; the comparison being the control process) in accordance with said communication protocol (see “As part of providing the GFR service, a conformance algorithm is used...” recited in column 1, line 56-67; the GFR being the communication protocol) based on said packet acquired by said packet acquiring means, and estimating the normal information corresponding to a processing result that said designated transmitting and receiving control process is normally performed (see “maximum frame size (MFS)” recited in column 1, line 65-66; that is, frames transmitted in the GFR service would have a maximum frame size of the MFS), wherein said nonconformity information defines a relation between the state information calculated by said calculation means when there is said nonconformity and said normal information (see “If the value of the Cnt variable is greater than the MFS...” recited in column 6, line 24-29; nonconformity being the relation where Cnt is greater than the normal MFS).

Hernandez-Valencia does not disclose the following features: regarding claim 1-2 and 6-7, wherein the state information is calculated from a header information and payload information of a required kind of the packet;

Gothé discloses a header synchronization detector including the following features.

Regarding claim 1-2 and 6-7, wherein the state information (see "determine if a detected transmission conforms to the receiver's protocol" recited in column 1, line 32-35; and see "correlation output signal" recited in line 1, line 50; both of which are considered state information) is calculated from a header information and payload information of a required kind of the packet (see "each block has a synchronization segment or header synchronization header...Protocol detector 16 then correlates the header sync pattern of its protocol continuously to the received signal" as recited in column 1, line 36-40).

It would have been obvious to modify the system of Hernandez-Valencia using features, as taught by Gothé, in order to conduct a more thorough nonconformance test.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hernandez-Valencia (US 6,266,327) in view of Gothé (US 6,049,577) as applied to claim 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Aoki (US 6,757,255).

Hernandez-Valencia and Gothé disclose the claimed limitation. Hernandez-Valencia and Gothé do not disclose the following features: regarding claim 5, wherein said state information includes a total number of transmitting and receiving packets, the

maximum value or minimum value of packet size, and the round trip time up to receiving a response packet to the transmitted packet.

Aoki discloses an apparatus for and method of measuring communication performance including the following features.

Regarding claim 5, wherein said state information (explained in the rejection made to claim 1) includes a total number of transmitting and receiving packets (see "total number of packets" recited in claim 6), the maximum value or minimum value of packet size (see "maximum value...of the packet size" recited in column 11, line 41-42), and the round trip time (see "round trip time" recited in column 7, line 26) up to receiving a response packet (see "an ACK packet receiving time" recited in column 3, line 32) to the transmitted packet (see SYN packet transmitting time" recited in column 3, line 31-32) .

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Hernandez-Valencia and Gothe by using the features, as taught by Aoki, in order to better detect nonconformance of data transmission

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hernandez-Valencia (US 6,266,327) in view of Gothe (US 6,049,577) as applied to claim 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Foster (US 2002/0159389).

Hernandez-Valencia and Gothe disclose the claimed limitation. Hernandez-Valencia and Gothe do not disclose the following features: regarding claim 8, packet

filter means for selecting only a required packet based on the header information of packet acquired by said packet acquiring means and transferring it to said calculation means.

Foster discloses a method and system for connection preemption in a communications network including the following features.

Regarding claim 8, packet filter means (see "filtering is performed at the ports..." recited in page 5, paragraph 41) for selecting only a required packet based on the header information of packet (see "filter communication based on...header..." recited in page 5, paragraph 41) acquired by said packet acquiring means (see "When the port receives communication, it determines whether any of the filter parameters are..." recited in page 5, paragraph 41) and transferring it to said calculation means (disclosed in Hernandez-Valencia in the rejection to claim 6 and 7).

It would have been obvious for one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Hernandez-Valencia and Gothe by using the features, as taught by Foster, in order to preserve processing resources on packets that do not need to be processed.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ju-Tai Kao whose telephone number is (571)272-9719. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday ~Friday 7:30 AM ~5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kwang Yao can be reached on (571)272-3182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/733,758
Art Unit: 2616

Page 14

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ju-Tai Kao



KWANG BIN YAO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

